

Subject: Reception at Dr Klachko's House on 15 Oct 1966

Source: Eu, K, Ma

1. Both, DRACH and PAVLYCHKO confirmed again that 23 people were sentenced to various terms, up to 6 years, in recent trials in the Ukraine for anti-Soviet activities. They stressed in particular that they were persecuted not "just for any cultural actions" because their doings had an explicit political and clandestine character. Their activities were focused not on cultural matters only but on subversive anti-regime actions as well. PAVLYCHKO and DRACH mentioned again KARAVANSKYI whom they described as a former OUN member who was "re-starting" his former political activities. He also was a former Gestapo-collaborator from Odessa. When Eu remarked that this was impossible because in Odessa Siguranza and not Gestapo was active, PAVLYCHKO replied that it didn't matter because KARAVANSKYI was collaborating with "the occupant". PAVLYCHKO added that "the whole matter was much more serious than you think" To give those present at least rough idea what was it all about he pointed at the fact that 12 or 14 typewriters were confiscated during the arrests which were used to typing anti-governmental materials. Neither PAVLYCHKO nor DRACH ^{could say} ~~what~~ exactly court was trying HORYNS and the others. They assumed this was an oblast-court ~~in~~ in Lviv. Asked by YAREMKO Ivan whether there was any appeal, PAVLYCHKO replied that there was none, and explained that there was no point in making one because the whole matter was "quite clear". Neither he nor DRACH could say what paragraph was applied in those cases. Both mentioned also that there were protests and appeals on ~~the~~ behalf of the defendants made by their colleagues and friends. They indicated that some people from the Union of Writers, some scholars and other important people intervened in favor of the arrested. As an example PAVLYCHKO mentioned Lina KOSTENKO who came for that purpose ~~even~~ to Lviv and was present at Horyns's trial. Some of the sentenced have been in the meantime released like RUSYN and MASIUTKO. They ^{did not} ~~finish~~ their terms.

2. In a tete-a-tete conversation with EU DRACH told him the following: The regime had quite good reasons for arresting at least some of the people involved. There were some inexperienced young people who misjudged the situation because they thought that after liquidation of the cult of personality they could do whatever they wanted. It was not so. When they started wider actions the authorities became frightened that they won't be able to control "the new fire" and decided to act "in time". Indeed, it was a serious matter.

According to DRACH, one of the sentenced - HORYN Bohdan - will be soon released. As to ZALYVAKHA Panas, he lived in IVANOFRANKIVSK and as EU understood DRACH was also there tried. ZALYVAKHA was involved in Sheshory-accident, namely he was one of those who were arrested prior to the adjourned Shevchenko ceremony at that place. The authorities found out in advance that some people were ~~going~~ going to use the Shevchenko Monument unveiling ceremony for anti-regime demonstration and deferred it for one week or so. In the meantime they arrested the suspected and among them ZALYVAKHA who was a sculptor. In his house, during the arrest, the KGB found Eisenhower's speech delivered on Shevchenko ceremony in Washington, D.C.

3. DRACH also confirmed that there were demonstration in May 1966 at Shevchenko Monument in Kiev, some people laid a wreath, and sang patriotic songs. This was not, however, on 22 May but a few days later.

4. DRACH assured EU that he had no doubts whatsoever as to the strength and potentialities of Ukrainians in the Soviet Union and was quite optimistic about their future despite recent setbacks. Once or twice he whispered into EU's ear that he believed in the spirit of Ukrainian nation.

5. DRACH called LEVCHUK Tymish the gravedigger of Ukrainian cinematography. He was the one who also "withdrew" Drach's latest film "Krynytsia Dla Sprahlykh".

6. DRACH told EU that in the near future a group of Ukrainian writers and poets will visit Zelenyi Klyn in the Far East in order to organize cultural activities for Ukrainians living there.

SECRET

When Eu commented that this ^{was} obviously connected with Chinese interest in Ukrainian affairs and was to be regarded as a countervailing measure on the part of Russians, DRACH did not reply directly, but only murmured something to the effect that "indeed the Chinese problem was a serious one".

7. DRACH told Ma that he felt very awkwardly now because here in New York he has to defend such positions which he attacks ~~himself~~ in Kiev. He referred to the matter of arrests and ~~general~~ ^{the} situation in literary ~~politics~~ and in politics in general.

He also complained that he as a poet has to make politics because there are not enough people in other fields who should do it. He did not know for instance, any historian ^{in Kiev} who would think the same way as he did.

He was not the only one among poets who were involved in politics. There were many others and this was bad because "we should write poems and not play politics". ~~politics~~ To make his poems understandable for Ukrainian masses he ~~had~~ ^{has} to lower his standard and his poetry is suffering from that.

He cannot write like Vasyl Symonenko. The latter wrote simply about most complicated problems and every khakhol could understand him. But ~~Drach~~ Drach himself was unable to do so.

Drach complained to Ma that he felt very lonely in New York because in the Mission there ^{is} no one he knows.

He mentioned to Ma that he ^{had} encouraged HOLOBORODKO to go to Moscow and study there cinematography because this was the only place where talents ^{in this field} could be really developed. "I know you probably would not approve of that but believe me this is the only way to learn something really good and then use it for our own cinematography"- he explained. However, HOLOBORODKO refused to go to Moscow, returned to his Donetsk and was writing now poems. In Drach's opinion he had a great talent but now was wasting it.

8. Drach did not participate in discussion on religious topic but when he stayed with Dr K after other guests left, he told her that this problem was completely new to him and he would like to discuss it with her in the future. He meant the question of

SECRET

invite DRACH and PAVLYCHKO to the reception given to VIRSKY at New Yorker Hotel on 17 Oct 1966. On this occasion he explained that beside him, from the Mission, there will be KOCHUBEI and NEPYIVODA. DMYTRUK won't come because she was too big^a shot ~~Wass~~ for such reception".

14. YAREMKO Ivan sided all the time with CHERNIAVSKY, PAVLYCHKO and other Sovs. This led to one or two incidents with Dr K and others but YAREMKO continued to pursue his line.